

REMARKS/AGRUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added. The claims are patentable over the cited art of record.

1. Summary of the Office Action

Claims 27-29, 33-35, 38-40, and 44-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,119,152 (“Carlin”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,389 (“Chung”).

Claims 18 and 19 stand allowed.

Claims 30-32 and 41-43 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

2. Response to § 103 Rejections

Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner for reconsideration of claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-14, as amended.

*To establish a **prima facie** case of **obviousness**, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).*

Claim 27 has been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claim 30. The Office Action objected to cancelled claim 30, as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 27, but indicated that claim 30 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, the inclusion of the limitations of claim 30 into claim 27 places claim 27 and its dependent claims 28, 29, and 31-34 in a condition for allowance.

Claim 35 has been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claim 30. The Office Action objected to cancelled claim 30, as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 27, but indicated that claim 30 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Although claim 35 is distinct from claim 27, the Applicants believe that the inclusion of the limitations of claim 30 into claim 35 places claim 35 in a condition for allowance, because neither Carlin nor Chung, or a combination thereof, discloses “a sales system for coupling to a communications network, comprising: a first sales interface at a first network address, the first sales interface including a first set of user interface elements; a second sales interface at a second network address, the second sales interface including a second set of user interface elements; and a sales server at a third network address that operates the first and second sales interfaces while providing an impression that they are being operated by different entities, wherein the sales server includes a customization interface responsive to user input to define the first and second sets of user interface elements, wherein the customization interface is operative to provide different headers for the first sales interface and for the second sales interface, and wherein the first sales interface includes links to a first set of pages not operated by the sales server but being mapped to the first domain, and wherein the second sales interface includes links to a second set of pages not operated by the sales server but being mapped to the second domain”, as required by claim 35.

Claim 38 has been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claim 41. The Office Action objected to cancelled claim 41, as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim 38, but indicated that claim 41 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, the inclusion of the limitations of claim 41 into claim 38 places claim 38 and its dependent claims 39, 40, and 42-45 in a condition for allowance.

Claim 46 has been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claim 41. The Office Action objected to cancelled claim 41, as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 38, but indicated that claim 41 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Although claim 46 is distinct from claim 38, the Applicants believe that the inclusion of the limitations of claim 41 into claim 46 places claim 46 in a condition for allowance, because neither Carlin nor Chung, or a combination thereof, discloses “sales method for operation through a communications network, comprising: receiving customization commands from a first accountholder; receiving customization commands from a second accountholder; presenting a first networked sales interface through the network for the first accountholder based on input received from the first accountholder; presenting a second networked sales interface through the network for the second accountholder based on input received from the second accountholder, and wherein the steps of presenting are performed by a provider for the accountholders, and present the first and second networked sales interfaces in such a way that they provide an impression that they are operated by the accountholders, and wherein the steps of presenting present different headers for the first networked sales interface and for the second network sales interface, and wherein the steps of presenting present the first networked sales interface as including links to a first set of pages not operated by the sales server but being mapped to the first domain, and present the second networked sales interface as including links to a second set of pages not operated by the sales server but being mapped to the second domain”, as required by claim 46.

3. **Conclusion**

Having tendered the above remarks and amended the claims as indicated herein, Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections have been addressed and that the claims are now in a condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Elena Dreszer at (408) 947-8200 ext. 209.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 05-06-04, 2004



Elena B. Dreszer
Reg. No. 55,128

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 947-8200